



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Griechische Grammatik (Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre und Syntax), von Dr. KARL BRUGMANN. Dritte Auflage. München, 1900.

The appearance of a new edition of Brugmann's Greek Grammar, thoroughly revised, and enlarged to more than double the size of the previous edition, is an event of prime importance. The last decade has been unusually productive of Greek grammars of large scope, but none of these serves the same purpose as Brugmann's grammar. The Kühner-Blass furnishes the most complete collection of the actual facts of the language, but with meagre or often antiquated explanation of the historical development. The Historical Greek Grammar of Jannaris is of value on the side of mediaeval and modern Greek, but in its historical treatment of ancient Greek and the dialects is hardly more than a piece of dilettantism. Except for the syntax, Gustav Meyer's Griechische Grammatik was once a rival of Brugmann's as an historical grammar, and, although its author never grappled with the problems with quite the same incisiveness and *savoir faire* as Brugmann, its greater fullness gave it a certain advantage. But the last edition of Meyer's grammar was a distinct disappointment. One feels that the author, whose illness was perhaps already approaching, tried to introduce the new material which had come to light since the previous edition, and the new literature on many questions, with the least possible amount of revision. New citations were often added mechanically to the old paragraphs, when these should properly have been thoroughly revised in the light of the additions. The result was a work which is neither fish nor fowl: as a collection of material it is less complete than the Kühner-Blass, and as an historical grammar it is no longer up to date.

The new edition of Brugmann, on the other hand, with its complete revision and great increase in size, is substantially a new work, and beyond all question is *the* historical grammar of the Greek language. Here, as elsewhere, the author combines a mastery of the material, remarkable for one whose field of work is necessarily so wide, with the keenest critical judgment and great power of systematization. Professor Brugmann is nothing if not systematic, so much so that his worship of system has been made the object of criticism. But consistency and a respect for system are invaluable qualities in dealing with the multiplicity of details and the chronological complications incident to the study

of historical grammar, and the lack of them depreciates the value of much otherwise brilliant work. In disputed questions, of which there are still so many, one may differ from this or that conclusion or may regard many an explanation as so uncertain as to be little better than a *non liquet*, but one may be fairly certain that the view adopted by Brugmann offers a working hypothesis which has been thought out in all its bearings.

It is an interesting question how widely Brugmann's grammar, in its treatment of the sounds and forms, has been and will be used by Greek scholars in general, those who have no special training or interest in comparative grammar, but who would be glad to assimilate its important results in the field of Greek. Surely no fault can be found with the manner of presentation, which is clear and precise. As for practical phonetics, no greater knowledge is demanded than is possessed by every trained student of modern languages, and should be expected equally of every student of the classics. Forms from other languages are of course cited here and there, but the pages are not so overloaded with these as to repel one who is not acquainted with Sanskrit, Old Bulgarian, etc. As for the general principles of linguistic development, a knowledge of which is, as the author emphasizes, more important than an acquaintance with Sanskrit, they are discussed briefly but clearly in the Introduction. If after all it is true, as we hope it is not, that the grammar remains a sealed book to many classical scholars, the reason can be only in the nature of the subject. No thoroughgoing treatment of the historical development is possible without a degree of subtlety and complexity which may well produce a feeling of confusion in the reader, unless offset by a more severe application to the subject than many are willing to give. Scientific progress in this field sometimes helps to a simpler and more comprehensive statement, but oftener it involves subtler distinctions, minuter subdivisions and more limited conditions than it was previously thought necessary to assume. This increasing complexity shows itself in many of the changes made in the work under review, e. g. in the treatment of Att. \bar{a} (§10), of the change of τ to σ (§48), of the forms of comparison (§230), etc., etc. It is of course feasible to produce a brief historical grammar of Greek with emphasis on the more certain and obvious phases of development, but it is the fuller treatment, not a primer, that we expect and welcome from Brugmann.

The Introduction and the chapters on Phonology, Stem-Formation and Inflection, which form the subject of this review, occupy 362 pages as against 176 in the previous edition. The least change is in the Introduction. Two pages on the relation of Greek Grammar to Comparative Grammar are omitted, and the section on Methodology is correspondingly increased by the consideration of certain real or alleged limitations to the principle of the invariability of the phonetic laws. The impossibility of formu-

lating laws for such processes as assimilation or dissimilation of sounds not actually contiguous, haplology, etc., is attributed by the author to the peculiar and often isolated character of the individual cases, rather than to any difference in principle. The reviewer has been in the habit of accounting for this on the ground that in such changes the psychological element was so strong as to make them closely allied to the processes grouped under the name of analogy, processes which, admittedly, can not strictly be brought under laws in the sense in which the term is applied to mechanical sound-changes.

The sketch of the dialects is substantially unchanged. It is conceded that the classification given is one of convenience, and, like any other, is inadequate to represent fully the interrelations of the dialects. It may be suggested, however, that a paragraph might profitably be inserted, calling attention to some of the important points which the classification disguises, or at least does not bring out, e. g. that Boeotian, though put properly enough under the Aeolic group, might with almost equal propriety be classed with the Northwest Greek dialects, there being in fact a gradual shading off from Aeolic to Doric characteristics between Lesbian, Thessalian, Boeotian, Old Phocian and Locrian; or, again, that the Northwest Greek group stands in the closest relation to the Doric group,¹ possessing, as it does, the common characteristics of the Doric dialects (e. g. *δίδωτι*, *φέρωντι*, *φέρομεν*,

¹ There can be no question that the term North Doric, used by many scholars for what others call Northwest Greek, is *linguistically* appropriate. This fact is not given due weight by those historians who reject *in toto* the story of the Dorian invasion. Beloch's attempt, *Griechische Geschichte*, I, p. 62, to evade the evidence of the dialects can only be characterized as trivial. He recognizes with others that Arcadian is a relic of a dialect which once extended to the eastern and southern coasts, and of which Cyprian is an offshoot. The fact that in historical times the dialects of Argolis and Laconia are totally different he attributes to "the influence of intercourse with Greeks of other regions," and the further fact that these two dialects are closely akin to one another he says "is to be expected, considering their common origin." Unfortunately, most of the characteristics common to these dialects, and to those of the colonies as well, are not such as are found in Arcado-Cyprian. Beloch had better have put it the other way, and said "they are alike, as is to be expected, considering that they were subject to the same external influence." But what was this outside influence which so transformed the old dialects? There is evidence of Ionic influence on the coast of Argolis. Was it, then, Ionic influence? Unfortunately, again, in those characteristics in which the dialects of Argolis, etc., differ from Arcado-Cyprian, Ionic is nearer the latter. Did Arc.-Cypr. *φέρωνσι* revert to *φέροντι* under the influence of Ion. *φέρο(ν)σι*? Did the Arc.-Cypr. infin. in *-ναι* give way to *-μεν* under the influence of Ion. *-ναι*, etc.? No. The outside influence must have been such as to produce dialects differing as widely as possible from both Arcado-Cyprian and Attic-Ionic, but bearing the closest resemblance to the dialects of Northwest Greece. And whence came this influence if not through immigration—not indeed from the little land of Doris alone, but from the great Northwest! As some one has remarked apropos of Beloch's view, the fact that one can explain how a tradition *might have* arisen without historical foundation is a long way from proving that it did so arise. The general conception of the Doric invasion is too strongly supported by linguistic and other evidence to be so easily overthrown.

numerals in -κάτιοι, πρᾶτος, τέτορες, κα, γα, etc.), and differing from the Doric dialects no more than these differ among themselves (the only important differences are the dat. pl. in -οις for cons. stems, found in Locrian in common with Elean, but not in Old Phocian, and the use of ἐν cum acc., which the Doric dialects have replaced by ἐν-ς or its descendant).

Further comments must be brief.

§10, Anm. 2. κρίνη and εἰρήνη are not from κρίνᾱ and εἰράνᾱ, but from by-forms with original *ē*. For the former cf. Kretschmer, l. c.; for the latter note the appearance of εἰρήνᾱ on Lesbian and Cretan inscriptions (G. Meyer³, p. 98), and, now, in Delphian (Collitz, No. 2502, with Baunack's note, p. 662). Although the contrast between Att.-Ion. *η* and *ā* in other dialects is of course due in the great majority of cases to the retention of original *ā* in the latter, yet the dialectic preference for the *e* and *a*-sounds respectively, when once established, shows itself also in the unconscious choice of doublets, sometimes even in the case of the corresponding short vowels, e. g. Dor. κα, γα, ὄτα, ἱαρός, etc.

§17. A new example of the use of *o* for *ɸ* is seen in ὀλοαῖς (Att. δλαί, Hom. οὐλαί, δλβα- in glosses), on an inscription of Lycosura published by Leonardos, 'Εφ. 'Αρχ., 1898, pp. 249 ff.

The most decisive example of a genuine Ionic *ɸ* (i. e. not merely the letter *ɸ*, used for the glide sound, as in ἀɸυτοῦ) is furnished by the form Ἀγεσιλεɸο, from an inscription on a Proto-Corinthian lekythos in the possession of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.¹ This bears out the conclusion of Thumb, IF. IX 323, that it is unnecessary to question the reading of the Naxian *ɸ*ι[ɸ]ικαρτίδης.

§30. One would be glad of an explanation of Delphian κῆναν or κηῖαν 'burnt-offering.'

P. 57, footnote. Hoffmann's explanation of κλεομπόρου as from *κλεο-εμπόρου is declared impossible. But if the process of elision, which originated in sentence-combination, has extended to the first member of compounds so as to become a regular feature in composition (§132), why may not the opposite process of aphaeresis, which Brugmann admits in sentence-combination (§141), also make its appearance in composition? Such a supposition would also allow us to explain δᾶμωργός (Dor., Locr., El., Arcad.) from δᾶμο-εργός, without resorting to *δᾶμο-οργός (§55, Anm. 2), against which may be urged the absence of any other evidence for the existence in Greek of an *o*-grade form of this root. The contracted forms δημιουργός and *δᾶμωργός (Heracl. ἀμπέλωργικός) do not, of course, require -οργός. The conditions producing such aphaeresis in place of elision would still remain obscure, but no more so than in sentence-combination. The whole matter, as well as the phenomenon discussed in §48, deserves further investigation.

¹ An account of this lekythos was given in a paper read by Professor Tarbell at a meeting of the Amer. Phil. Association, July, 1900.

P. 62. "Dor. el. äol. \bar{a} aus ao und aus \bar{ao} , $\bar{a}\omega$." This is the accepted view, but leaves unexplained such forms as Selinuntian $\nu\kappa\bar{\omega}\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, $\nu\kappa\bar{\omega}\nu\tau\iota$ (Collitz, 3046; early 6th cent., so no possibility of Att. influence such as is claimed for Boeot. $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\bar{\omega}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$), Locr. $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\bar{\omega}\nu\tau\alpha$, etc., further Heracl. $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\bar{\omega}\rho\omicron\nu$, $\pi\bar{\alpha}\mu\omega\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, and the numerous examples of Doric proper names in 'Αγλω- (G. Meyer³, p. 205). If we assume that just as we have Dor. η from ae , but \bar{a} from $\bar{a}\epsilon$, so Dor. ω from ao , but \bar{a} from $\bar{a}\omega$, the forms mentioned are in order, e. g. $\pi\bar{\alpha}\mu\bar{\omega}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ from $*\pi\bar{\alpha}\mu\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$: $\pi\omicron\lambda\bar{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ (Loc.) from $\pi\omicron\lambda\bar{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$ (Pindar), just as $\tau\bar{\epsilon}\mu\eta\tau\omega$ from $\tau\bar{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\omega$: $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$ from $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$. Of the alleged examples of \bar{a} from ao , Boeot. $\phi\bar{\upsilon}\sigma\bar{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ can come from $\phi\bar{\upsilon}\sigma\acute{\alpha}\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ belonging to the type of presents in $-\acute{\alpha}\omega$, $-\acute{\eta}\omega$, $-\acute{\omega}\omega$ (cf. Boeot. $\delta\bar{\alpha}\mu\bar{\iota}\omega\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$), similarly Arg. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, unless one takes this with Brugmann (§322) from a present $\gamma\epsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\iota$, in which case it would not enter into the question. The only difficulty is with the forms of the 2d sing. aor. mid., like $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\xi\bar{\alpha}$. As such forms are known only from Theocritus and a grammatical notice, there is a possibility that they are 'hyper-Doric,' but, waiving this, they may be attributed to qualitative levelling with the other forms of the same tense.

§48, Anm. To $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\alpha\sigma\sigma\iota\varsigma$ and the other Argive forms with $\sigma\sigma$ may now be added Boeot. $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\iota\varsigma$ from an inscription of Tanagra, published by Reinach, *Rev. des étud. gr.*, 1899, pp. 53 ff.

§84, 6. It can not be accidental that $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ beside $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ is the regular form in many dialects and appears at an early period, whereas other examples of ν for $\gamma\nu$ are only sporadic. Obviously the unreduplicated $\gamma\epsilon\nu$ of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$, etc., has played a part.

§91. The assimilation of $\kappa\tau$ to $\tau\tau$ is also Boeotian. Cf. $\delta\alpha\kappa\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$ on the Tanagra inscription cited above.

§126. A new example of haplology is furnished by $\tau\bar{\alpha}\nu$ $\nu\epsilon\acute{o}\tau\alpha$ beside $\acute{\alpha}$ $\nu\epsilon\acute{o}\tau\alpha\varsigma$ on a Gortynian inscription published by Halbherr, *Am. Journ. of Arch.*, 1897, p. 192. The explanation of this as for $\nu\epsilon\acute{o}\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$, which occurred to the reviewer in reading Halbherr's comments, is also suggested by Brugmann in another place (p. 201, footnote). Whether the genitive $\nu\epsilon\acute{o}\tau\alpha\varsigma$ on the same inscription is also an example of haplology is more doubtful. Probably it is heteroclitic.

Gort. $\tau\bar{\alpha}$ $\tau\bar{\rho}\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\alpha$ almost certainly means 'a third,' not 'threefold' (Keil's interpretation as $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\iota}\omicron\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$, Mitth., 1895, p. 51, is unlikely), and so can not be from $*\tau\bar{\rho}\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega\tau\tau\alpha$.

§145, p. 152. "Es bedeutet das die Entstehung eines prinzipiell neuen Akzents, der das Uebergewicht gewann über den alten Hochtou einer seiner Stelle vorausgehenden Silbe, *aber schwächer war als der ihm nachfolgende alte Hochtou*." The last clause, which I have italicized, only perpetuates a misconception involved in III and V of Wheeler's well-known statements. The new accent originated in a secondary accent which arose whenever the original free accent had left more than a certain number of morae unaccented. But when the original accent was already

within these limits, a secondary accent had no *raison d'être*, and there is no reason whatever for assuming its existence, 'schwächer' or otherwise. As a matter of fact, Brugmann no longer makes any use of it in explaining accent-shifting within the last three syllables. All such changes must be explained as special processes such as the dactylic shifting, or as due to analogical influences within the several suffix categories.

§§153, 159, 160. Brugmann's classification of compounds is so widely adopted that it would perhaps be unwise to tamper with it. But one can not help feeling that the distinction between Classes II and III is not a vital one. In each language there are certain adverbial prefixes which are not found outside of composition, but which occur separately in other languages, and so are not separated by Brugmann from Class III. Why make a separate class for the two prefixes which are not found separately in any language, especially as one of these, the negative *η-*, is after all only the reduced form of the *ne* which does occur separately? Far more important seems the distinction between what is given as subdivision 2) of Class III (adjectives which have sprung from prepositional phrases, e. g. *ὑπερ-άνθρωπος*, Lat. *ab-normis*, etc.) and the other subdivisions of the same class.

§230. One of the most striking examples of levelling between the forms of comparison is seen in Heracl. *πολίσιτων* (Tab. Her. I 130), which has replaced *πλείσιτων* under the influence of *πολὺς*. This explanation occurred to the writer before noting that it had already been given by Hornolle, *Bull. corr. hell.*, 1891, p. 627. So also Meister, Collitz, 4629, note.

§231. A new example of the Aeolic inflection of the perfect participle and, at the same time, of the older formation without *κ* (cf. Boeot. *ἑξέφυκονομειόντων* and *ἀποδεδόανθι*) is seen in Boeot. *δεδωῶση* (nom. pl. f.) from the Tanagra inscription already quoted.

§232. For *ῖα* see now J. Schmidt, *KZ.* 36, 391 f.

§256. "Vgl. *πούς* neben *τρί-πος* (Verf., *Ber. d. sächs. G. d. W.*, 1897, S. 191)." The form *-πος* remained for a time in compounds supported by the influence of adjectives of the second declension (Brugmann, l. c.). But note the further development in Cretan. By contrast with *πῶς* and under the influence of neuter *s*-stems, *-πος* came to be felt as a neuter form. Cf. Gortyn. *τὸ καρταῖπος* (passages quoted by Miss Searles, *Lexic. Study of Grk. Insc.*, s. v.). It has even affected a preceding substantive, so that we find once acc. sg. *σὺς καρταῖπος*, though *τὸν σὺν* follows in the same sentence.

§332. To Arc. *ἀδικέντα* add now *κύνεσαν* and *μνέσθαι* from Lycosura ('Εφ. 'Αρχ., 1898, p. 249). Note also from the new Elean bronze *δαμοσιόια* like *γνοία*, and *δαμοσιῶμεν* in contrast to *θαρρῆν*; also Gortyn. *δαμῶμεν* (*Am. Journ. of Arch.*, 1897, p. 206) in contrast to *μωλέν, κοσμέν*.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, July, 1900.

CARL DARLING BUCK.